

App. No.: 10/711340
Filed: September 12, 2004
Conf. No.: 5339

Page 5 of 5

REMARKS

The indicated allowability of claims 6 and 7 subject to their being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. Claim 6 has been so rewritten and thus is believed to be allowable along with claim 7, which depends on it. Claim 8 has been added and comprises claim 3, but dependent on claim 7 rather than claim 2. Therefore it is believed that this claim is likewise allowable.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 1-5, the Examiner's careful reading of claim 1 upon the Hall et al 4,064,824 reference is truly appreciated. Claim 1 has been rewritten to further emphasize its patentable distinction. That is the second check valve is in a series flow relation to the first check valve so that either or both check valves prevents the reverse flow. In the Hall reference the two check valves operate in parallel flow so that both must be closed to prevent reverse flow unlike applicant's arrangement so that it does not achieve the same protection.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that the case is now in form for favorable reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Deutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time

App. No.: 10/711340
Filed: September 12, 2004
Conf. No.: 5339

Page 5 of 5

REMARKS

The indicated allowability of claims 6 and 7 subject to their being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. Claim 6 has been so rewritten and thus is believed to be allowable along with claim 7, which depends on it. Claim 8 has been added and comprises claim 3, but dependent on claim 7 rather than claim 2. Therefore it is believed that this claim is likewise allowable.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 1-5, the Examiner's careful reading of claim 1 upon the Hall et al 4,064,824 reference is truly appreciated. Claim 1 has been rewritten to further emphasize its patentable distinction. That is the second check valve is in a series flow relation to the first check valve so that either or both check valves prevents the reverse flow. In the Hall reference the two check valves operate in parallel flow so that both must be closed to prevent reverse flow unlike applicant's arrangement so that it does not achieve the same protection.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that the case is now in form for favorable reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time